S. HRG. 99-492

NOMINATION OF RUSSELL A. ROURKE TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON THE

NOMINATION OF

RUSSELL A. ROURKE TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

DECEMBER 3, 1985

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

58-391O WASHINGTON : 1986

S201-21

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina	SAM NUNN, Georgia
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia	JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire	GARY HART, Colorado
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine	J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PETE WILSON, California	JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama	ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
PHIL GRAMM, Texas	JOHN GLENN, Ohio

JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*
ALAN R. YUSPEH, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE C. DAUTH, *Chief Clerk*

NOMINATION OF RUSSELL A. ROURKE TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1985

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met in open session, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room SD-138, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Strom Thurmond presiding.

Present: Senators Thurmond, Warner, Cohen, Gramm, Nunn, Exon, and Bingaman.

Staff present: James F. McGovern, staff director and chief counsel; Arnold L. Punaro, staff director for the minority; Alan R. Yuspeh, general counsel; Jeffrey H. Smith, minority counsel; Christine C. Dauth, chief clerk; Patrick A. Tucker, counsel; Gerald D. Strickler, printing and documents clerk; John J. Hamre, Ronald P. Kelly, David S. Lyles, Russel E. Milnes, and Ann E. Sauer, professional staff members; Patricia L. Watson, research assistant; and Marie Chaillet, staff assistant.

Also present: Gerald J. Smith, assistant to Senator Goldwater; Romie L. Brownlee, assistant to Senator Warner; James H. Dykstra, assistant to Senator Cohen; Henry D. Sokolski, assistant to Senator Quayle; Mark J. Albrecht, assistant to Senator Wilson; Allan W. Cameron, assistant to Senator Denton; Alan Ptak, assistant to Senator Gramm; Jeffrey B. Subko, assistant to Senator Exon; John Keely, assistant to Senator Levin; and Milton D. Beach, assistant to Senator Glenn.

[The nomination reference and biographical sketch of Mr. Rourke follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, NOVEMBER 14, 1985

Ordered, that the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Russell A. Rourke, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice Verne Orr.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF RUSSELL A. ROURKE

Russell A. Rourke was appointed by the President to serve as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs on March 14, 1981. He was confirmed by the U.S. Senate on May 4, 1981, and was sworn into office on May 7, 1981.

As Assistant Secretary, Mr. Rourke is the principal advisor to Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger on congressional consideration of the Department's legislative program, maintains direct liaison with the Congress, the Executive Office of the President and other Government agencies on defense legislative matters, and oversees the military departments Congressional activities on defense matters.

Prior to May, 1981, Mr. Rourke served 19 years as Administrative Assistant to several Republican Members of Congress, including Representative Harold S. Sawyer (R-Michigan), 1977–81; Representative Henry P. Smith III (R-New York), 1965–74; and Representative John R. Pillion (R-New York), 1960–64.

In between his service on Capitol Hill, Mr. Rourke served on the White House staff from 1974–77. From 1976–77 Mr. Rourke was Special Assistant to President Gerald R. Ford. In this capacity he was responsible for legislative liaison between the White House and the Congress and participated regularly in policy and program meetings with the President, Members of the Cabinet and White House senior staff. From 1974–76 he was Deputy to Presidential Counsellor John O. Marsh, Jr.

Prior to entering Government service, Mr. Rourke was associated with the law firm of Keough, Carey and Costello, Washington, DC, from 1959–60. Also, in 1974 he was the Republican-Conservative nominee for Congress in the 36th District of New York.

Mr. Rourke has a distinguished military service record. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1953 and was released as a first lieutenant in 1956 following service in Korea. Mr. Rourke subsequently entered the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and retired with the rank of colonel in July 1985 following 32 years of service. His personal decorations include the Legion of Merit.

He was born December 30, 1931, in New York City, NY. He graduated from the University of Maryland in 1953 where he received his bachelor's degree with honors. In 1959 he received his LLB from the Georgetown University Law Center.

Mr. Rourke was married in 1961 to the former Judith Anne Muller. They have three daughters: Patricia, Elizabeth, and Mary Frances.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, PRESIDING

Senator THURMOND. The committee will come to order. The committee meets this morning to consider the nomination of Mr. Russell Rourke to be Secretary of the Air Force. As all members of the committee are very well aware, Mr. Rourke is presently Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

It is not often that the committee has the pleasure of considering the confirmation of any individual as well known as he is. We are all aware that he has served with distinction as Assistant Secretary of Defense. He is universally well respected by the Members of the House and Senate and his advancement to Secretary of the Air Force is deserved and most justified.

Prior to his service in the Department of Defense he served for 19 years as administrative assistant to several Members of Congress. He also served on the White House staff from 1974 to 1977 and was special assistant to President Gerald Ford.

He spent a brief period of time in the private practice of law and was a nominee for Congress in the mid-1970's. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps with the rank of first lieutenant. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve with the rank of colonel. His personal decorations include the Legion of Merit.

He did his undergraduate work at the University of Maryland and received his law degree from the Georgetown University Law Center.

I should note for the record of this hearing that he has met with the members of the committee staff in order to review his financial holdings and there will be no conflict of interest between Mr. Rourke's holdings and his governmental responsibilities upon confirmation.

At this time I would like to recognize Senator Nunn for any statement he would like to make. Then we shall hear from any other members who may have an opening statement.

Senator Nunn.

Senator NUNN. Thank you very much, Senator Thurmond.

I know all of us this morning have our thoughts not only here, but with Senator Goldwater and his wife. I know that all of us are thinking about her and about our chairman and hoping for her a very speedy recovery.

I talked to Senator Goldwater yesterday and he is going to try to get back here next week, but he has a very tough situation with her hospitalization.

I want to welcome along with you, Chairman Thurmond, Mr. Russ Rourke and his family this morning. I know his wife is with us today. I am sure that gives him a great deal of backing and support and we are delighted to have her.

Russ has had a long and distinguished career, both on the Hill and in the executive branch. We want to consider this nomination, Mr. Chairman, in a very timely fashion so that we can give Russ the chance of testifying as the Secretary of the Air Force before this committee on reorganization soon. [Laughter.]

We will be taking up little matters like whether the staffs of the Secretary should be merged in the service and things like that. It should give him a great deal of pleasure to tackle that subject at the very beginning of his tenure.

Also, I am encouraged now because on reorganization we note there has been a certain amount of skepticism by the Marine Corps and the Navy. Now that we have a Marine taking over the Air Force we probably can have more interservice cooperation in this overall area. Senator Warner will take judicial notice of that.

Seriously, for the next several years we are going to have a very difficult time in the Department of Defense and the Air Force will be no exception. Given the fiscal realities, given the mood towards trying to get the budget under control, it is going to put a premium on tough and innovative management, martialing the Department of Defense resources and establishing priorities in such a way as to get a maximum amount of military capability for every dollar spent.

We have a number of important projects in the Air Force, probably more at this stage than any other service. The advanced technology bomber and advanced cruise missile are two of those projects. I have followed those two with interest for a long time.

I have asked for certain replies on the record in regard to those programs. They are long and detailed, but very important replies and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put those in the record for reply by Mr. Rourke. We will probably be alluding to those during the hearing.

I also want to just state that Secretary Verne Orr has been an effective spokesman for the Air Force. I have put a long statement in the record commending him for his distinguished and effective service. I know the committee, each of us, feels that way about his tenure in office.

I will have certain questions, Mr. Chairman, this morning. I also have the responsibility, though, of being on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations where we have had hearings on some of the security problems we have.

I plan to support Mr. Rourke's nomination. I am sure he will do a very fine job in that position.

Mr. ROURKE. Thank you, Senator.

Senator THURMOND. I want to say in the beginning that Senator Goldwater backs this nominee very strongly. He deeply regrets he cannot be here. He is hoping to come back next week. We all have been praying for his wife who lost a leg and our sympathy goes out to him and his family at this time.

Senator WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I have known the nominee for a decade. We have worked together in a variety of capacities. He has had my support from the very start of this long process that hopefully will be concluded in a brief period.

I wish him and his family well. I know he will do a commendable job for the President in the Department of the Air Force.

Mr. ROURKE. Thank you, Senator.

Senator THURMOND. The Senator from New Mexico.

Senator BINGAMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have no opening statement. I do think this is an excellent nomination the President has made. I am pleased to support Mr. Rourke in this position.

Mr. ROURKE. Thank you.

When does the bad news start? This is getting me a little bit nervous.

Senator THURMOND. I imagine you are pleased with what you hear. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROURKE. Yes, sir; no complaints.

Senator THURMOND. The Senator from Maine.

Senator COHEN. The "buts" are coming, but not from me. I, too, Mr. Chairman, wish to join the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations this morning and will not be able to attend the hearing much longer.

I want to take the occasion to say I have known Mr. Rourke since I have been in the Senate. I not only have worked with him, but traveled with him. I expect as a condition to his nomination today that he once again will travel to the Wehrkunde Conference and partake in those heavy discussions and responsibilities during the course of that conference. I look forward to seeing you there in February.

Mr. ROURKE. I look forward to it, Senator. Thank you.

Senator THURMOND. The Senator from Texas.

Senator GRAMM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Russ, I always thought you were doing a good job, but since no one proposed bad news to you, I am beginning to bring that conclusion into some question. The bad news is that you are going to the Air Force at a time when we are going to have a tight budget constraint.

I agree with Senator Nunn that we are going to face difficult years in trying to meet the Soviet menace, on the one hand, and the deficit menace on the other. They are both very difficult menaces. We are going to require leadership and knowledge and ingenuity. I know you have all three of those. That is why I am for you and I am ready to vote, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THURMOND. Tomorrow we would like all the members to be present at a meeting in which we want to discuss the fact that

the Appropriation Committee is going several billion dollars over their authorization which is very important. We will take that up after the meeting tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Rourke, I have to go to the White House, leaving in about 2 minutes. I will ask the next ranking member, Senator Warner, to take charge of the hearing.

We have some questions here to be propounded which I will ask him to propound and any others he wishes to propound. Then we will give every member here a chance to ask questions.

If there are no objections, after the meeting tomorrow I thought we would take action on your nomination when we have all the members here, at least have more than we have now. As far as I know, I have heard no objection to your nomination. I think you have done a fine job, you deserve to be confirmed. We will do everything we can to get that done.

I want to ask the able distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. Warner, to take the Chair.

Mr. ROURKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THURMOND. The prepared statement of Senator Wilson will be inserted in the hearing record at this point.

[The prepared statement of Senator Wilson follows:]

Mr. Rourke, I congratulate you on your appointment to this important position and very much look forward to working with you during what can only be termed "difficult" times. Unfortunately, I believe that the next few years will see a sharp decline in the level of defense resources. This will be especially critical for the Air Force since your outyear program includes some large cost increases. I am especially concerned about the outyear profiles of certain key strategic programs in the Air Force account. Our committee will be taking a very close look at the cost effectiveness of new strategic programs. And I would strongly encourage you and your staff to look at the cost effectiveness of these programs and the alternatives that may exist. I assure you that this committee will place heavy emphasis on cost effectiveness and will be diligently searching for alternatives to programs that fail to meet stiff cost effectiveness criteria. It is unfortunate Mr. Chairman, and in my opinion shortsighted for us to be driven to such narrow criteria, but this situation I fear will be thrust upon us by a Congress bent on reducing defense spending.

Senator WARNER [presiding]. Senator Nunn, why don't you ask your questions in view of your commitment.

Senator NUNN. I do not have very many this morning. I have talked about most of these subjects with the nominee on several occasions.

I am concerned, as Senator Gramm indicates, about communications and about the combination of the tight squeeze we are going to have on fiscal policy in general and the effect that is going to have on defense in the year or two ahead. I think the Air Force, perhaps more than other services, maybe not, has more new programs that are of a very large nature.

We have programs like the new ICBM, small ICBM, AMRAAM, C–17, advanced technology fighter, and it goes on and on, including whatever happens to the MX. Combine that with a real serious budget squeeze, perhaps below the zero level of defense spending in terms of real dollars, and it is going to put a real premium on management.

One thing that bothers me, even before we have this budget squeeze, is if you look at the maximum efficient production rates for Air Force procurement, that is, the production rates that are possible, based on the overhead already expended and geared up

for, the Air Force is something like 60 percent maximum efficient production rates on existing aircraft being built. This means that an awful lot of overhead is not being maximized.

In other words, we just are not producing to the maximum efficient rate.

The other factor relates to what happens when that squeeze becomes even more difficult than now. Are we going to cut down on efficient production? Are we going to keep all systems going at the expense of efficiency? Are we going to cut out some systems?

Do you have general views on how you will approach that problem in general?

STATEMENT OF HON. RUSSELL A. ROURKE, NOMINEE TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. ROURKE. Yes, sir; Senator, I do. You are quite right. As a result of what has been a blessed situation for the Defense Department and, I think for the country, Congress has given its support to defense programs in the last 4 years. We have been able to fill those bins and modernize our forces. But that day is fast coming when we will not be able to continue.

In fact, the day might be here already, as Senator Gramm has indicated by some of the initiatives he has taken. We will spend many, many hours and many long nights looking at all our programs.

I think the real question is first, what are those weapons systems that enable us to accomplish our mission? Then, in a corollary fashion, we must look at the most beneficial way, in terms of dollars spent, for benefits received from those systems.

That sounds like a rather bureaucratic answer, I realize, but we have to get the mission accomplished. Understanding what the threat is and then obtaining the capability of countering it in the most efficient, cost-effective way is a prime consideration. But the mission, I think, does come first.

We will be applying, like no other time in this administration's history, the midnight oil to refine programs and to analyze the difference between vertical cuts in programs and stretchouts.

It is an argument that I know, Senator, you have worked on since the days you came to Washington. But in this budget time, as we are looking also at the prospect of whether arms control is realistic or not, we are going to have to make some very, very hard choices.

I will be working with General Gabriel and, obviously, I will be working with Secretary Weinberger and the White House in reaching judgments as to how we can best save the moneys in the decreased budgets that are levied on us and still accomplish our mission.

Senator NUNN. We have a 2-year budget process for the military that is supposed to begin in fiscal year 1988. There is supposed to be a plan submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense on how that is going to be implemented by July 1, 1986.

Do you have thoughts on the 2-year authorization?

Mr. ROURKE. Yes, sir; I do. I know of your initiative. I think it is a fine idea. The only question is whether our friends on the appro-

priations side will agree to the extent the authorizing committees have, and whether that idea will become a requirement for the Department of Defense.

It would indeed be a benefit to us. The only caveat I would point out is if in the off year of that biennial budget there were as many budget review requirements placed on the Department. As a practical matter, we really would not achieve the benefits that should accrue with a 2-year budget if that happens. I trust the appropriating committees will see the vision that you have pointed out. I'm sure we can work very closely with the Congress in sorting out the problems that might be avoided so that a 2-year budget does not become a spurious thing. That way it really will be a 2-year planning program and budget cycle and we will enjoy the benefits from it.

By benefits I do not mean avoiding the work. But it is a heck of a lot better in the planning process and in the execution phase to have 2-year budgets as your initiative proposes.

Senator NUNN. The question of whether it is properly implemented will depend not only just on the Department of Defense, but also on the Congress. We have to gear our hearing so that the first year we take a 2-year look and the second year we do not take a look again.

If we don't do that, we will be doing the same thing over again. I hope that it can be done.

Do you have any general thoughts on reorganization?

I was being somewhat facetious in my opening remarks about that. Nevertheless, you are going to be Secretary of the Air Force. As soon as you are confirmed, which I believe you will be, you will be dealing with those issues.

You have been in a position as key adviser to the Secretary of Defense. Now you will be part of the overall team. How do you visualize the following two things?

First, your relationship as Secretary of the Air Force to the military side?

And, second, how do you visualize your relationship to the Secretary of Defense in your new position?

Mr. ROURKE. On the latter part first, it will be slightly different than my former role. I have had and will continue to have enormous respect for Secretary Weinberger. He is one of the toughest and yet most gracious individuals I have ever met.

How he puts up with—this is not the purpose of your question, I know, Senator—but how he gets through his day, his week and his year is absolutely beyond me. Enormous pressures are placed on him and yet he has carried out his responsibilities with little gratitude.

I am not talking about the Congress, I am talking about how he is perceived in many areas in this country as crusty, implacable, intractable. He is none of those things. He is tough as nails, but only to accomplish the basic mission shared with you and the members of the committee, to maintain the security of this Nation and, hopefully, ensure world peace.

I don't want to go too far, I know that was not the purpose of your question. But let me say Cap Weinberger is one hell of a guy and a man for whom I have the greatest respect. I have worked

with him very closely over the last 5 years and I think that relationship will continue, albeit in a slightly different focus.

I will be representing the interests of the Air Force. That does not mean to the exclusion of the other services or the other departments with their burdens of Government. That is all in one package.

As to the services and the reorganization part of your question, Senator, yes, I have had some involvement in that. I am on the so-called Cox Committee at the Pentagon. I have been assigned the responsibility for going through the Locher report, the workings of your committee and the hearings held thus far, and the hundred odd recommendations.

As Secretary Weinberger indicated, and we have gone through each recommendation, he could support better than 50 percent of them.

When you get into the JCS area, I might point out we have a meeting this afternoon at the Pentagon in the tank with the Chiefs. Unfortunately, Secretary Weinberger is out of town, but his views are fully represented there as they were last week in reviewing the JCS portion of the situation.

You will be hearing from the Chiefs, I understand. In spite of the unfortunate circumstances of Senator Goldwater's wife, those hearings will be ongoing, as I understand it. We will be reviewing again the discussions that we initiated last week in terms of the Chiefs' position.

I might point out that there has been a very flexible relationship between Secretary Weinberger's views and those of the Chairman and the members of the Joint Chiefs.

On the balance of the reorganization, since I have viewed things from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, to view it for a brief while, if I am fortunate enough to become Secretary of the Air Force, from that side of the house to see how the civilian side really does interact with the so-called blue suiters.

Senator NUNN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WARNER. Thank you, Senator Nunn.

The Chair proposes to ask a series of questions, but I will accommodate the members who are present here and defer the questions prepared by staff until later.

Senator NUNN. Mr. Chairman, let me make sure I understand. We were going to talk about the appropriation authorization problem this morning, but my understanding is Senator Thurmond prefers to talk about that tomorrow. I want all our members to know that.

I am going to have to go to this other hearing of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We are going to vote on this nomination tomorrow, I believe.

Senator WARNER. I would like to tell other members of the committee just in the event they want to submit some questions they might wish to be answered, we will expedite it as best we can.

Senator Exon.

Senator EXON. Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to object to what Senator Thurmond has requested. I am just saying, though, that tomorrow might be a very difficult day for this Senator to be here because of a series of actions on the floor. I am wondering if, to

solve the problem with the nomination here, we could possibly take action and poll the committee on that.

Senator WARNER. Senator, that is an option. Senator Thurmond had to leave so quickly for the White House I did not have an opportunity to consult with him, nor he with the staff. As such, the course of action is not certain at this point. We will try to clarify it.

Senator NUNN. We normally would have polling permitted.

Senator WARNER. It seems to me that would be a preferable course and it is likely one we will take. Nevertheless, he has made a statement and we will have to do what we can to get it straightened out.

Now, turning to the subject of the nomination of Mr. Rourke to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. Rourke, as I look at the progress of the summit and the joint statement issued and the presumed—and I say presumed because they are not definitive yet—instructions to the negotiators, in the event the Summit is useful, and I think we all hope it will be, a very substantial impact of the proposals now on the table, should they be adopted in some form or another, would fall on your budget.

For example, a 50-percent reduction in nuclear weapon systems. There is also on the table the thought of eliminating the mobile missile and that goes to the Midgetman Program, which is one of your main programs.

My question to you is: How would you propose to handle your programming and budgeting in the light of these contingencies?

Mr. ROURKE. Senator, you have pointed out probably one of the most complex and difficult questions that we do face. This problem is not without its bright side, however. I hope and trust that we are placed in that position. I hope that is a problem that the Defense Department will get.

I might point out that in preparation for this hearing while in meetings with our various sections within the Department of the Air Force we looked at it from a dual standpoint.

We looked at what the benefits would be that would flow, albeit in a negative way, to the Department of Defense if the suggestion that you point out became reality and if mobility or rather the Midgetman, became something that was taken off the table in a positive sense and how we would handle that in our programming stage.

And, indeed, we looked at the other side with congressional interest in protecting the fiscal solvency as well as the defense interests of this country, the initiatives taken by Senator Gramm and others, if they became realities, how we would approach that issue.

I might tell you the answer is with great care and it would not involve a single answer, or a single meeting, but a whole series of analyses by all departments and all hands to see how we could work this thing out.

What the Senator from Texas has proposed, for example, is evolutionary and revolutionary. I know it is in the best interest, as he sees it, of the country. But it would require, obviously, bureaucrats in and out of uniform to do the kind of things they have not done for 200-odd years and that is to do some budgeting very rapidly and with great sensitivity.

My answer to your question, then, is a very careful analysis of a very complex ball game. It will require an extraordinary effort by the Department of Defense to see whether we are ratcheting down in a manner that still preserves the peace and security of the Nation.

Senator WARNER. It seems to me until such time as there is clarity—I use that word "clarity"—in the negotiations which will give you a strong sense of assurance that an outcome will likely be, say, elimination of the mobile segment of the strategic program, I would urge you not in any way to diminish the intensity, financial and otherwise, of your department to effect the President's request.

Mr. ROURKE. Indeed, we are not. The budget is proceeding just as if Geneva never happened, but with a hopeful eye to some positive outcomes. Also, with an intelligent eye to Congress and what might occur in terms of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings initiative.

Senator WARNER. Otherwise the Members of Congress would have perfectly legitimate grounds on which to stand to say the President's program may not come to fruition; because of arms control developments, there is no need to have the funding as high perhaps as he wishes.

Mr. ROURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WARNER. Do you agree to appear before any appropriate committee of the Congress and to answer fully and honestly any questions that may be put to you including statements of your personal opinion when requested?

Mr. ROURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WARNER. There has been a great concern about the efficiency and effectiveness of the defense procurement process.

What is your view of the state of the procurement efficiency in the Air Force?

What priority do you plan to give acquisition matters in your capacity as Secretary?

At the conclusion of your answer to that question, I will defer to Mr. Exon and the distinguished Senator from Texas and then I will resume with the balance of these questions.

Mr. ROURKE. In answer to your direct question, acquisition matters will get one of the highest priorities we can possibly give.

I think the Air Force has no equal. This is not denigrating the other services, but I think the Air Force has done an extraordinarily good job in the procurement process. Acquisition matters have been high on the Air Force's list of priorities. The Air Force has taken several competition initiatives in the past: Competition on the fighter engine, the oncoming competition in the fighter aircraft area, and the wide variety of initiatives establishing competition advocates and contractor operation reviews. The Air Force has taken a whole string of initiatives and established a wide variety of groups, committees and advocates to put to rest, if you will—it will never be put to rest, but to expose the lie to the suggestion that the industry in this country is a group less than honest, less than dedicated to the peace and security of our Nation.

I think, even as your own full committee chairman has pointed out, the so-called horror stories that have plagued the Pentagon in the last 2 years rest with a minimal percent of the basic products of the Department of Defense and the contracts that we let.

As you know, the Department of Defense takes some 55,000 contract actions a day. If we are 99.9 percent perfect in all those initiatives, we still have several hundred horror stories popping up. They are the only ones, obviously, that get headlines and get in the news.

I am not telling you anything that the members of this committee do not already know. What hurts, though, is that we might be throwing the baby out with the bath water in condemning all contractors on a daily basis.

I am convinced the same percentage of industry in this country that the chairman spoke about who brought us through our Nation's wars, helped to make America secure, helped to keep the rest of the world free—the free part of the rest of the world—are still dedicated to making a reasonable profit and provide the U.S. Government and the American people with weapon systems that do work.

That does not mean, however, that we should not go after, hammer and tongs, the minimal percent of industry that have not done the job, and contractors who have seen fit to get it where they can. We have an extraordinary series of initiatives that have been taken, as you know, by the inspector general and the Department of Defense.

I met in the last several weeks with the inspector general of the Air Force and he chronicled for me the number of initiatives he and the Department of the Air Force have taken. He explained the number of companies that have been black listed and those that have been referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

Having said that, I reiterate my former statement that this is a minimal number of people. But the public perception is that the Department is loose. We have lost credibility with the American public through the Congress.

I hope to assist in turning that around and to call attention to the good job, the great job, that American industry has done in providing us the basic national security mechanism that has helped keep us free. But at the same time, I intend to get to that minimal number of rascals who are dragging the basic goodness down.

Senator WARNER. Thank you.

Mr. Exon.

Senator EXON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I want to welcome you here and tell you I enthusiastically support your nomination. The record shows this morning that this Senator wanted to move your nomination along today rather than wait until tomorrow.

I have just two questions.

First, when you become Secretary of the Air Force, and I am sure you will, would you agree to look into a particular matter that I have been checking into and maybe give a report back to me?

This is one of those situations for which I claim no particular expertise. We have been making inquiries of the Air Force now for some time regarding an accident that killed a constituent of mine. According to the Air Force, the pilot's death was due to G loss of consciousness in an F–16 fighter.

I suspect that part of this problem may be that fighter pilots by their nature do not wish to have any limiting or warning devices

regarding the performance of their planes. While we have to rigorously train our pilots, I am not convinced yet that they receive the full training that is necessary to prepare them to deal with the potentialities of the loss of consciousness.

I take it that there are no warning devices that would alert a pilot to a situation in which he is likely to encounter the possibility of G loss consciousness.

I am wondering if you think we have done enough in this area and whether you think our training is adequate? I am also interested in knowing whether or not you think that possibly warning devices would be in order, or is that a bad idea?

Mr. ROURKE. I am not sure it is a bad idea, Senator. I know of your interest in the subject of G loss of consciousness. As a matter of fact, I met in the last several days with general officers in the Air Force to discuss not only your concern, but the tragedy that befell the O'Brien family in this instance.

There are certain changes. The Air Force takes it very seriously. The seriousness of it is how do you protect the lives of our pilots and still train them for their basic mission, that is, to fight in combat.

Senator EXON. I understand that.

Mr. ROURKE. You do understand that. Having said that, the Air Force is approaching the problem with great sensitivity, having in mind the concerns expressed by Mr. O'Brien and properly by yourself.

They have already instituted a number of changes, one of which is a new G suit valve, so-called high flow, which has been retrofitted into all F-16's and incorporated into production.

There are a variety of other changes that are being studied. I do not propose to mislead you as being an expert in this area, but your concern and the concerns of all pilots are being taken into consideration. Your interest and concern, expressed to the Air Force, resulted in a meeting, not to satisfy the normal constituent inquiry kind of thing, but to see how we can better protect our pilots in the manner you suggested.

But a new G suit valve known as a high flow, ready pressure valve is under study, also an Auto Save system is under evaluation.

But everything will be done to preserve and protect the lives of our pilots and at the same time continue to give them that combat training that you agree they need.

Senator EXON. I think we recognize and realize that we have the best trained pilots in the world. I recognize that it is tremendously important that they do take the risks they take in training.

Training from that standpoint is different from practice. Training must closely approach actual combat and if pilots do not perform we in training, then they might not be able to perform well when their lives are placed in even greater jeopardy in a combat situation.

I just feel that maybe there is something more we can do. I appreciate the meeting you held to look into this problem. I was not aware of that before. I do hope you will keep looking into it. I am not saying there is any all right or any all wrong on this thing, Mr. Secretary, but I do think we have joint responsibility to do everything we possibly can to make certain that we are giving our young

men and women not only the realistic training they need, but also some safeguards, such as warning devices, that they deserve.

Again, not being a pilot, I do not begin to understand all of that, but I know the nature of a fighter pilot. I suspect that they, themselves, might be the ones that would not want a warning light or alarm to come on. Again, I do not know. Even if they object to it, it may still be prudent to install warning systems.

I have another question if I can, Mr. Chairman.

I suspect that although it is not directly under your control, it is going to affect the Air Force and all the other Services. What I am talking about is the squeeze that is taking place with the amount of money that we are going to be putting into our national defense.

There are many of us who are very much concerned, Mr. Secretary, that as the squeeze comes on once again, we are going to sacrifice the conventional forces and readiness to support new weapon systems, particularly more MX's or SDI.

All those more exotic SDI programs I am very fearful are apt to take precedence over conventional readiness. I, for one, feel that while I am strongly in support of most SDI programs, I deeply feel that we are probably most likely to be tested by the Soviets in the future in the conventional readiness area, either directly or through their surrogate nations.

So, I just want to emphasize, if I might, that I hope as Secretary of the Air Force, you will realize and recognize that somewhere we may have to give up or extend out some of these more challenging research programs. I think you as Secretary of the Air Force will carry a particularly heavy burden. I just want to mention this to you.

Mr. ROURKE. Thank you, Senator. It is one of our highest priorities, readiness and sustainability. I appreciate your comments on it. It will remain a high priority.

Senator EXON. One last question.

How do you feel about the Reserve and Guard forces and the need for improvement in their equipment as they play an ever increasing role in our future defense strategy and planning?

Mr. ROURKE. I feel very strongly about it. In fact, as you know, the Air Force has probably become the model for coordination and cooperation with the Guard and Reserve and the degree to which they have given responsibilities to the Guard and Reserve.

It is probably the quintessential example with respect to other Services. I served in the Reserves for 29 years in another service, but the Air Force, and it is not because I sit in this chair today, the Air Force, I think, stands by itself in setting the finest example for giving real live responsibilities to the Guard and Reserve. There are many fine examples of which you are aware in terms of air crews for KC-10's and KC-135's and the fact that 70 percent of the tactical communications responsibility rest with the Air Reserve forces.

There is a list as long as your arm that indicates the degree to which the Guard and Reserve are measured with the regular Air Force in the total force concept and we will continue that spirit of cooperation that has worked magnificently in the Air Force.

Senator EXON. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WARNER. Thank you, Senator Exon.

The Senator from Texas.

Senator GRAMM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rourke, let me first say that one of the things that has always concerned me about defense budgeting is that defense programs are often rear-end loaded. We begin with a very small expenditure on R&D and then we move through a ramp-up process.

One of the things that has concerned me in this whole debate about defense spending is that we have so many programs that are in the budget with rear-end loading that I often wonder if anybody has ever cranked out the spend-out pattern on those programs and looked at what the level of expenditure on them would be, 3 or 4 or 5 or 10 years out.

That concerns me because I guess one of my greatest fears about the coming years is that we are going to be through with funding the R&D and engineering and all these programs, whether you are talking about the C–17 or whether you are talking about the advanced technology bomber, and that we are going to spend all this money getting ready to go into production and then we are going to realize that we are going to see programs crowded out and all of that expenditure is going to be lost.

Do you share those concerns?

Are people looking to 3, 5, 10 years out as to what the ramp-up of these programs will be and how feasible that is going to be, given our budget situation?

Mr. ROURKE. Yes, Senator, I do share those concerns.

There is always that temptation to get your foot in the door without regard to what the total budget might require down the road.

There are people constantly looking at those kinds of things to remove the temptation. It is an honest temptation by someone whose responsibilities might not include the total picture, but individual programs and parts of that program.

In my OSD experience, for example, I witnessed the workings over a 5-year period of Dave Chu, whom you know very well, the director of our Program Analysis and Evaluation Office. David is a brilliant individual.

I have heard his speech, not unlike the statement you have just made, on at least 50 occasions. He speaks about the pyramid, inverse if you will, that results from those kinds of programs, certain kinds of programs, that if not properly evaluated in the downstream phase, can squeeze you out.

It has been suggested, and I am not brilliant enough to evaluate that at one sitting, that despite our efforts to curb that kind of undertaking, those temptations in certain areas might have already taken hold. It is something we have to constantly watch out for, especially if we get into a reverse spending cycle such as we might now be facing. Then the damage can become real and not just prospective.

Senator GRAMM. Let me urge you to look at that and work on it. In this committee we reduced authorization substantially from the President's proposal. We achieved zero real growth in budget authority commitment but we made no changes in the out years.

We did not zero out a single major program. So, we made a once and for all adjustment to meet a budget constraint, but we in no way changed the planning horizon. Ultimately someday as we go further down this road, that decision is going to have to be made.

I just wanted to leave with you my concern that we make our decisions now as to what we are going to do in the next 5 to 10 years, that we look at programs realistically in terms of what we are going to be able to spend, and if we are not going to be able to build a new weapon system, then we ought not to be spending all the money on R&D and simply carrying it in the budget, bleeding money off other programs that are desperately needed.

The second point I would like to make is that I would like to urge you to use the new budget concerns that we have to do things we have always wanted to do and never could get done. I am a firm believer that in adversity and tough circumstances there are a lot of good things that can occur.

I have to admit when I came to the Senate, I thought I was about as jaded as anybody could be from having been through all my hard wars in the House, but the pork orgy in conference with the House as we stripped money out of MX and SDI and the cruise missiles to fund everybody's pet project back home, to fund all the programs that had constituents, would even turn a rock stumbler like me into convulsions.

I want to urge you to take a look at these programs. If the Midgetman is a political creation—I happen to believe it is and maybe I am prejudiced on it—but if you conclude that it is, kill it. Come out and say, "Look, we cannot fund every program and this is a program that we do not believe is going to work, that we do not believe is going to be deployed, and, therefore, we are not requesting any money for it."

If we have huge continual add-ons for programs you do not support, have the President veto the bill. I want to urge you to use this tight budget situation we are in to do things that the people back home want done, but because of the politics as usual, the log rolling that is involved anytime you are spending $302 billion to use this new budget reality to do things you have always wanted to do, but have never been able to do.

Look at bases and if bases are not needed outside Texas, close them down. [Laughter.]

We have given broad new authority, that is, to long and hard effort on the Conference Committee, to contract out services to gain efficiency, and we all know the powerful political forces against contracting out, but again with the budgetary circumstances we have, it opens up avenues to do things for economy reasons that we wanted to do for efficiency reasons anyway.

I urge you to look at those in your new position as Secretary of the Air Force, a position that in this reorganization that Senator Nunn was talking about, I hope to see strengthened, I hope you will use that new power and influence of your office to try to promote the kind of efficiency that people want and that Congress will accept if they are forced to accept it.

Mr. ROURKE. Those are all good thoughts, Senator, and we will bear them in mind as we struggle through this thing. I appreciate

your suggestion that the position of the Air Force might be strengthened. There are those, of course, who would eliminate it.

Senator GRAMM. Let me assure you I am not one of them. I do not want a big bureaucracy in the Department of Defense. I see it in the area you are leaving, not the area you are going.

My view is that the Service Secretaries are involved in an area that the Department of Defense should not be, in the area of training and supply and recruitment. I think those should be areas under the Secretary's jurisdiction.

Mr. ROURKE. Indeed.

Senator GRAMM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WARNER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

We will keep the hearing record open for a 24-hour period during which time other members can submit questions to you for your review. Then I will resolve the question of polling out your nomination and sending it to the Senate floor.

Unless there is something further you have, Mr. Rourke, I consider this hearing closed on a very favorable note and wish you luck.

I remember a famous Secretary of the Navy who went on to hold several Cabinet positions and to be a candidate for the Presidency who said the best job he ever had in his entire life—he was a Democrat—was Secretary of the Navy. While the Secretary of the Air Force cannot equal that, it may very well be the next best thing.

Thank you very much.

Mr. ROURKE. Thank you, sir.

[Questions submitted by members of the Armed Services Committee to be answered for the hearing record follow:]

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PETE WILSON

C-17

Senator WILSON. Strategic force for modernization and readiness is high on the Air Force mission priority list with enhancement of force projection close behind. The C-17 airlifter is scheduled to enter the inventory in the 1990's to help alleviate a serious shortage of airlift. The senior leadership in the Air Force, as well as Army and Marine Corps, has been on record as strong supporters of the C-17 program.

Based on your observations from the DOD perspective, will you continue to encourage Air Force support of the C-17?

Mr. ROURKE. Yes. I will continue to encourage Air Force support for the C-17 program as has been done in the past. The C-17 is the Air Force's top priority program to meet long-term airlift requirements and provide needed force projection capability enhancement.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JEREMIAH DENTON

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE "DENTON AMENDMENT"

Senator DENTON. Mr. Rourke, I presume that you are familiar with the provision of section 1540(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for 1985, which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use space available transportation to move privately-supplied humanitarian relief supplies to Central America. The Congress has recently approved the expansion of that authority, sometimes known as the "Denton amendment," to the entire world.

Could you give us any information about how the amendment has been implemented to date?

Mr. ROURKE. In calendar year 1985 the Office of the Secretary of Defense forwarded requests for transportation of 448,185 pounds of cargo under the Denton authority. The Air Force has transported 364,451 pounds of that cargo (81 percent) with more of it scheduled to move in January 1986.

Senator DENTON. Have there been any problems, from the point of view of the Air Force, with the implementation of the amendment?

Mr. ROURKE. No.

Senator DENTON. Can you summarize your approach to the implementation of the amendment?

Mr. ROURKE. To date, the Air Force has not received any transportation requests under the expanded authority. Our approach will be to have the donor deliver the cargo to the MAC Aerial Port serving the appropriate area of the world, and transport the cargo space available on MAC aircraft.

Senator DENTON. What problems do you see with its implementation?

Mr. ROURKE. The requests for transportation under this authority exceed the Air Force's space available capability. The Air Force does not routinely fly empty aircraft, and space available is limited. The very nature of space available transportation prohibits the Air Force from diverting aircraft to onload or offload Denton cargo. So, even when an empty aircraft is identified, if it is not originating from a location near a donor and terminating at a donor's requested destination, it cannot be used to transport the cargo.

Senator DENTON. Do you have any suggestions for changes to the law in the future that would assist in the movement of humanitarian relief supplies?

Mr. ROURKE. No.

Senator DENTON. Can you give us any indication of the kinds of resources that are available, in terms of space available aircraft and ships, for the transportation of supplies to Central America?

Mr. ROURKE. The Air Force cannot commit resources for space available transportation. Space available is a by product of other activities. The Air Force has taken an aggressive approach in identifying space available to Central America and is working with the Southern Command staff to identify missions that may have space available, early on, so that donors can position their Denton cargo at the appropriate aerial ports. Also, we have been able to use space generated on Air Force Reserve overwater training missions to transport this cargo.

The greatest space available capability occurs twice a year in conjunction with Southern Command's two large JCS exercise redeployments. During these periods a number of empty aircraft position to Central America to onload troops and equipment returning to the United States. Other than these two redeployments, the frequency of space available transportation is sporadic.

Senator DENTON. Can you give us the same sort of information for the movement of goods to other parts of the world?

Mr. ROURKE. Space available to other parts of the world is very limited. Space is available to areas such as the Philippines and Europe, but aircraft flying to such areas as Africa and South America are flown with full cargo loads. Also, the training missions that generate space available to Central America, do not normally fly to other parts of the world due to the great distances involved.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR SAM NUNN

STREAMLINE PROCUREMENT PILOT PROJECT

Senator NUNN. For some time I have argued that we need to find ways to expedite the procurement process. I think it would be very worthwhile trying to acquire a number of conventional programs with expedited procedures, as a pilot project.

I think we should waive all the rules, regulations, and laws and provide in their place certain guidelines. I think we should try to get a few projects launched next year as pilot projects to see if it would work.

Do you think this is a good idea?

Would you review with the Air Force this concept and recommend some attractive candidates for such treatment?

Mr. ROURKE. Yes. I think this is a good idea. We are constantly searching for methods to expedite the procurement process. At the request of the Air Force Chief of Staff, both Air Force Systems Command and Air Force Logistics Command are reviewing potential improvements to the acquisition process through our Innovation Task Force. Should this study identify techniques worth testing, we will develop "pilot" programs to evaluate them.

We clearly have a firm foundation on which to build. We should maintain the momentum of the initiative already taken by yourself and Senator Goldwater and within the Department of Defense.

[Whereupon, at 10:56 a.m., the committee proceeded to other business.]

[The nomination of Russell A. Rourke, was reported to the Senate by Senator Thurmond on December 4, 1985, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on December 5, 1985.)

○